

REMARKS

In this Response, claims 6-8, 16, 25 and 26 have been amended to correct for various antecedent relationships. Claims 28 and 29 have been added. Support for these amendments and additions is found throughout the originally submitted specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2-12, 14-19, and 21-29 are pending.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections

Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21-23, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur (U.S. Patent No. 6,808,758) (hereinafter "Thakur") in view of O'Carroll et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,559,424) (hereinafter "O'Carroll") and Timans (U.S. Patent No. 6,835,914) (hereinafter "Timans"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In the Office Action, Timans is relied upon to provide "a reflective device (40, Figure 4) having first (42) and second zones (44) wherein each zone has a different reflectivity (column 12, lines 53-65)." The Applicant's respectfully disagree with this characterization of the teachings of Timans.

The referenced portion of Timans teach a reflector 40 having a reflective layer 42 coated with a light absorbing layer 44. See Figure 4 and associated discussion. The purpose of the light absorbing layer 44 is to filter the light that is being reflected by the reflective layer 42 in order to reduce the amount of reflected light at a given wavelength. A person skilled in the art would not read this light absorbing layer 44 in a manner to teach, suggest, or imply "a reflecting zone having a first reflectivity" as recited in claim 25 and as it would be understood in light of the specification. In fact, a person skilled in the art would read the light absorbing layer to teach away from a reflecting zone in order to achieve the stated purpose of the absorbing layer, i.e., to reduce the amount of reflected light.

For at least these reasons, claim 25 is patentable over the cited articles, alone or in combination.

Claims 3, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 21-23, and 26-27 either depend from, or include elements similar to claim 25. Therefore, these claims are patentable for at least the above reasons.

Claims 4, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur, O'Carroll, Timans, and Lee et al (U.S. Patent 6,753,272 hereinafter "Lee"). These claims either depend from, or include limitations similar to claim 25. Because Lee does not correct for the deficiencies discussed above, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur, O'Carroll, Timans, and Li et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,641,302, hereinafter "Li"). These claims depend from claim 25. Because Li does not correct for the deficiencies discussed above, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur, O'Carroll, Timans, and Gat et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,895, hereinafter "Gat"). This claim depends from claim 25. Because Gat does not correct for the deficiencies discussed above, this claim is patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur, O'Carroll, Timans, and Grant et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,228,206, hereinafter "Grant"). These claims depend from claim 25. Because Grant does not correct for the deficiencies discussed above, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Thakur, O'Carroll, Timans, and Noguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,219,786, hereinafter "Noguchi"). These claims include limitations similar to claim 25. Because

Noguchi does not correct for the deficiencies discussed above, these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above.

New Claims

The Applicants have taken this opportunity to present new claims 28 and 29, which depend from claim 25. In addition to being patentable over the cited references for the same reasons as claim 25, these claims present additional respective points of patentability such as:

- the first reflecting zone configured to reflect radiation towards a first area, while the second reflecting zone is configured to reflect radiation towards a second area; and
- the first reflecting zone configured to receive radiation provided by the flash lamp in a first direction, while the second reflecting zone is configured to receive radiation provided by the flash lamp in a second direction.

For at least these reasons, these claims are also patentable over the cited articles.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-12, 14-19, and 21-29 are in condition for allowance. Thus, early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 3/27/06



Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981

- 9 -

Attorney Docket No. 110348-134668
Application No. 10/815,068

IPN P17741 (Intel Corporation)